

Volunteer Service. He is widely recognized and respected as a leader and innovator whose guidance and dedication stand as a national model of outstanding service to the elderly and others in need.

On October 21, at the American Association of Homes and Services for the Aging's 36th annual meeting and exposition in New Orleans, Mr. Dewhirst will complete his term as the organization's chairman, after having served as its top elected leader since 1995. Prior to that, he served with distinction in the association's house of delegates and as a member of its board of directors for 7 years. As immediate past chairman, he will continue to serve on the board as it strives to advance the association's vision, adopted under Mr. Dewhirst's leadership. That vision, which the association's 5,000 not-for-profit member espouse, calls for the development of a comprehensive system of care and services that recognizes the dignity of all persons and enhances the quality of life for older adults and others with special needs.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor and pleasure to congratulate James E. Dewhirst on 2 exemplary years as chairman of the National Association of Homes and Services for the Aging, and on his most distinguished record of service to older Americans.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 2, 1997

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article on campaign finance reform by the former Governor of Delaware, Pete du Pont:

[From The Wall Street Journal, Sept. 24, 1997]

PRICE CONTROLS ON DEMOCRACY

(By Pete du Pont)

Hard cases, it is said, make bad law. The hard cases of Clinton campaign cash corruption are pushing Congress toward very bad law—the McCain-Feingold bill, which would, in effect, impose price controls on political involvement.

The First Continental Congress understood well the consequences of legislated prices, which had been imposed during the Revolutionary War. In June 1778 it concluded that "limitations on the prices of commodities are not only ineffectual for the purposes proposed, but likewise productive of very evil consequences to the great detriment of the public service and grievous oppression of individuals."

But the failure of price controls reaches back to the beginning of government. As Robert L. Scheutinger and Eamonn F. Butler document in "Forty Centuries of Wage and Price Controls," in 2150 B.C., the Kingdom of Babylon adopted the Code of Hammurabi. Among its provisions were wage and price controls. For example, the code said the price to hire a 60-ton boat shall be "a sixth part of a shekel of silver per diem," and the pay of a carpenter "four grains of silver per diem."

BOUNDLESS AVARICE

Twenty-five centuries later, in A.D. 284, the Roman Emperor Diocletian, complaining of "raging and boundless avarice," decreed

that "maximum [prices] be fixed" for all foods and services. Hoarding, riots, a black market and a failed economy soon followed. Four years later Diocletian abdicated his throne.

Sixteen centuries after that, nations ranging from Lenin's U.S.S.R. to Hitler's Germany to Richard Nixon and Jimmy Carter's America imposed wage and price controls. All failed to achieve their purpose and caused more problems than they solved.

So it makes perfect sense in the world of Washington to insist that they be imposed again. This time Sens. John McCain (R., Ariz.) and Russ Feingold (D., Wis.), aided and abetted by Common Cause, the New York Times and President Clinton, want to impose price controls on political speech and campaigns. Their legislative proposal contains a wide variety of price controls: On campaigns (an overall spending limit), on private broadcasters (advertising rates), on government (postal rates) and on out-of-state contributors to a candidate (the proportion of contributions they may give is restricted).

The legislation is a mind-numbing example of government by the numbers. The overall spending limit for Senate races "shall not exceed the lesser of \$5,500,000, or the greater of \$950,000 or \$400,000 plus 30 cents multiplied by the voting age population not in excess of 4,000,000 and 25 cents multiplied by the voting age population in excess of 4,000,000." Oh, that is unless the candidate runs in a state that has no more than one VHF TV transmitter licensed for operation, in which case 80 cents is substituted for 30, and 70 for 25.

In addition the bill proposes free television time for candidates. Each candidate would be entitled to a total of 30 minutes, to be used Monday through Friday between 6 and 10 p.m., in minimum bites of 30 seconds and a maximum of five minutes; but no more than 15 minutes on any one station. Breathing-taking in its complexity, McCain-Feingold calls to mind a statement attributed to Soviet official Vladimir Kabaizhe in 1936: "We cannot tolerate the proliferation of this paperwork any longer. We must kill the people producing it."

Other reformers offer alternative schemes of government control. Max Frankel, writing in the New York Times Magazine, is for "chasing political commercials off the air and giving ballot-worthy candidates enough free air time to present themselves to the voters." Two think-tankers, Thomas Mann of the Brookings Institution and Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute, want to eliminate political party "soft money" and narrow the definition of how much an individual or organization can spend advocating or opposing a public policy issue. And House and Senate Minority Leaders Richard Gephardt (D., Mo.) and Tom Daschle (D., S.D.) want to amend the Constitution, weakening the First Amendment to permit campaign price controls.

All of these ideas are bad economics, bad politics and, as 40 centuries of experience have proved, very bad public policy.

In addition to the First Amendment problem—the Supreme Court ruled unanimously in *Buckley v. Valeo* that political contributions are protected speech—there are enormous fairness issues. Mr. Frankel's formulation hints at them: giving "ballot-worthy candidates" free air time. So who is "ballot-worthy?" Strom Thurmond and the Dixiecrats in 1948? Eugene McCarthy's challenge to Lyndon Johnson in 1968? Harry Browne or Ralph Nader, last year's Libertarian and Green candidates for president? What impartial arbiter would decide who may or may not run for election in America?

Another affront to liberty is the McCain-Feingold proposal to limit a candidate's out-of-state contributions to 40% of all contribu-

tions. Under such a provision, non-Louisianans who don't want to see David Duke elected to the Senate might be unable to contribute to his opponent.

Limiting issue advocacy is another clear and present danger to American democracy. McCain-Feingold would permit the federal government to regulate campaign speech that contains "express advocacy" intended to affect an election. But advocacy of issues is what elections are about. There should be more of it, not less.

Any state or local party activity, from voter registration to kaffeeklatsches, that "might affect the outcome of a federal election" would also be covered by national campaign controls, effectively federalizing local elections. All this is Big Brother writ large, a bit of Leninism superimposed on modern America.

Finally comes the question of political action committees. Let's be clear, we are not talking of legalizing illegal acts—foreign contributions to political campaigns, solicitations from government offices or making contributions in the name of another. We are considering whether people of similar beliefs—union members or right-to-life advocates—may contribute to a common organization to increase their political impact.

HONORING JAVIER GONZALEZ 1996
CALIFORNIA TEACHER OF THE
YEAR

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 1, 1997

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a special individual and an outstanding young educator, Javier Gonzalez of Pioneer High School in the Whittier Union High School District, located in my congressional district.

Mr. Gonzalez, a young man of humble origins, is a graduate of my alma mater, James A. Garfield High School in East Los Angeles. He has risen to the top of his profession in 6 short years by being named the 1996 California Teacher of the Year. Born to a large family, he is the 8th child of 21. His family immigrated to the United States in search of better opportunities in education and employment. He thanks public education and the programs afforded to him to help overcome the obstacles of learning a new language and for being the first in his family to earn a college degree.

Trained for a career in engineering, Mr. Gonzalez found his calling in education while serving as a tutor. He became fascinated with the power of education and his own ability to help young aspiring students reach their potential. He attained his bachelor of arts degree from California State University of Los Angeles in 1991 and his teaching credentials and master of arts degree from Point Loma Nazarene College in 1995. Mr. Gonzalez began his professional teaching career working with high school students in the Upward Bound Program at East Los Angeles College.

In 1990, Mr. Gonzalez began teaching at Pioneer High School. He currently teaches math, geometry, and algebra. He is the chair of the Pioneer Mathematics Department, GATE Advisory Committee, and also serves as its coordinator. He is an advisor to the California Scholarship Federation, Associated Student Council, and coach of the academic decathlon team. Mr. Gonzalez is a member of